

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are now pending in the application. Claims 19 and 20 are withdrawn. Claim 4 is amended herein. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 AND 103**

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kaneko et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,232,719). Claims 3, 4, 7, 9-12, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Kaneko et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,232,719). Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Kaneko et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,232,719) in view of Hataoka et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,890,236). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner asserts that Kaneko discloses a compound glass tube including an outer tube made of a first glass and an inner tube made of a second glass whose softening point is lower than that of a first glass of which a side tube portion is formed. The Examiner also asserts that the compound glass tube of Kaneko corresponds to 201 in Fig. 13; the inner tube made of a second glass corresponds to 55 in Fig. 12; and the outer tube located in tight contact with the periphery of the inner tube corresponds to 54 in Fig. 12. The glass sleeve 54 as an outer tube is also shown in Fig. 7 and according to the description of column 8 lines 53-55, "the glass sleeve is made of a material, in this case Vycor, whose melting point is lower than that of the outer lamp tube (the side tube portion of the present invention)." In other words, the outer tube of Kaneko is not made of a first glass, the glass forming the side tube portion, whereas the

outer tube of the present invention is made of quartz glass, the glass forming the side tube portion. Since the outer tube and the side tube portion are made of a same material, impurities can be suppressed from exuding out from a Vycor glass in the present invention (see page 20 lines 9-16 of the specification). Kaneko is different from the present invention in this regard.

The Examiner asserts that Kaneko discloses a step of heating, after the attaching step, a portion including at least the compound glass tube and the side tube portion at a temperature higher than the strain point temperature of the second glass. The Examiner applies the Kaneko's step of heating and melting the side tube portion 65 to both steps (d) and (e) of the present invention. However, the attaching step (d) and the hearing step (e) are separate steps; step (d) is followed by step (e). Kaneko discloses the attaching step (d) as in column 10 lines 52-60, but it fails to disclose or suggest the heating step (e) after the step (d). Kaneko is different from the present invention in this regard, too.

As above, Kaneko fails to disclose some of the structural elements of the present invention and the structural elements that Kaneko lacks cannot be found in other references, neither. Consequently, the present invention is novel and unobvious.

#### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and

favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Sept 8, 2006

By:   
Gregory A. Stobbs, Reg. No. 28,764

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

[GAS/JSB]